



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/826,009	04/16/2004	Mohamad El-Batal	LSI.96US01 (03-2331)	9215
24319	7590	11/15/2007	EXAMINER	
LSI CORPORATION			FRANKLIN, RICHARD B	
1621 BARBER LANE				
MS: D-106			ART UNIT	
MILPITAS, CA 95035			PAPER NUMBER	
			2181	
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			11/15/2007	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/826,009	Applicant(s) EL-BATAL, MOHAMAD	
	Examiner Richard Franklin	Art Unit 2181	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Richard Franklin. (3) Samuel M. Freund (Reg. No. 30,459).
 (2) Alford Kindred. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 09 November 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-18.

Identification of prior art discussed: Riggle.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



**ALFORD KINDRED
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant explained that his invention was for connecting newer and faster interfaces to slower legacy drives. Applicant stated that the system takes data at a first input speed, which is too fast for older legacy disk drives, and divides it into slower data streams which are slow enough to interface with the older legacy disk drives. Applicant stated that each of the slower data streams have the same throughput. Applicant agreed with the Examiner that the claims do not necessarily limit the second data streams to all be the same speed. Applicant pointed to Riggle (Col 7 Lines 3 - 19) which states that the system of Riggle can have the slower data streams each be the same speed. However, Applicant believes Riggle teaches away from the equal speeds in the next paragraph of the reference. The Examiner contends that Riggle does not teach away, but instead explains that the equal throughputs are possible to achieve, although with a disadvantage. The Examiner believes such a disadvantage is not a teaching away, but merely a design choice. Applicant then stated that the Riggle reference differs from the present invention because the first throughput is determined by the second throughputs. Applicant stated that in the present invention, the first throughput is not bound by the second throughput. The Examiner pointed out that the claims did not limit to such an interpretation, to which the Applicant agreed.